

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 19, 40 – 45, and 47 – 50 are presented. Original claims 20 – 39, 46 and 51 are cancelled, without prejudice. Claims 1, 40 and 45 are amended. The application as filed supports all of these amendments.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 13, 16 – 22, 24 – 32 and 35 – 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by GB-2020557 to Rüsç (“Rüsç”). The rejection of claims 20 – 22, 24 – 32, and 35 - 39 is moot with the cancellation thereof. Applicants submit that, with the present amendments to independent claims 1, 40 and 45, Rüsç does not anticipate claims 1 –3, 5 – 13, 16 – 19, 40 – 45 and 47 –49.

All of the pending claims as amended require a filter element having pores and having an opening in the expanded configuration which is larger than the pores. Further, the claims require a tubular sheath and that the filter element be expandable from a collapsed configuration when restrained in the lumen of the tubular sheath to an expanded configuration when unrestrained.

Additionally, method claims 40 and 45 each include a step of removing restraint on the filter element to expand the filter element. With respect to claims 40 and 45 Rüsç does not disclose any restraint, removal of which will allow the filter element to expand. With respect to claim 1 Rüsç does not disclose that the filter element is expandable from a collapsed configuration when restrained to an expanded configuration when unrestrained. Rather, Rüsç requires the use a push/pull motion on the operating element 5 and the controlling element 4 to collapse/expand the diameter of the expandable element 6:

If, by pulling on the operating element, 5, the controlling element, 4 is moved relative to tube, 1, that is, if the controlling element, 4 is

drawn out of the tube, 1, the end of the controlling element, 4, takes the head piece with it, so that the expandable element, 6, is expanded until it has attained approximately the form shown in Fig. 3. During this process, the shape of the mesh formed by the threads, 10, changes. If the head piece, 7, is further moved towards the tube, 1, the configuration of the expandable element, 6, represented in Fig. 4 is finally attained, the outer diameter of which is two- or several-fold the diameter of the non-expanded element, 6, (Fig. 1).

(page 4, lines 92-106, *inter alia*).

Accordingly, this rejection is unsupportable and must be withdrawn.

Additionally, Rüsç does not show or suggest a “guidewire,” while all of the present claims require a “guidewire.” A feature of the present invention is that the filter element is carried by a guidewire. In the context of the present application, the term guidewire is properly construed to mean an elongate component that can be used in combination with a number of medical devices, such as balloon catheters and atherectomy devices. In particular, these various other medical devices generally include a central or axial opening able to receive the guidewire, such that the medical device may be tracked along the guidewire from its free end towards its end within the patient’s body, the guidewire acting as a guide for positioning the medical device. The guidewire may also act as a guide for the retraction and removal of the medical device after it has been used. See the present application at page 39, lines 14 – 21; page 43, lines 5 – 13; page 43, line 27 – page 45, line 28; *inter alia*. This construction of the term “guidewire” is consistent with the meaning understood by those of skill in the art. See, for example, the definition of guidewire in White, et al., *A Color Atlas of Endovascular Surgery*, J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia, Pa., 1990, pages 26 –

27, a copy of which was included with the previous Amendment and Response, filed on October 11, 2004:

In general, guidewires are used to find and secure a pathway through the artery and the stenotic lesion. They pass well into the channel and act as a guide to the subsequent passage of therapeutic devices.

Rüsç does not disclose a guidewire. Rüsç discloses a medical instrument having a controlling cable 4 that functions as a controlling or positioning element (Rüsç, page 2, lines 48 – 57). The Rüsç controlling element or cable 4 is integrated within the internal structure of the device and cannot function as a guidewire. Further, an operating element is firmly attached to the controlling element 4 proximal end (Rüsç, page 4, lines 50 – 54), so that the operating element 5 may withstand pulling action to retract the controlling element 4 proximally (Rüsç, page 4, lines 92 – 99). In addition, a screw 3 protrudes radially. These structures would preclude the passage over cable 4 of other medical devices, such as balloon catheters and atherectomy devices.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 14, 15, 23, 33 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rüsç. Applicants understand this rejection as including the rejection of claim 4, inasmuch as claims 15, 23 and 34, also reciting nitinol for the filter element, are included in this rejection. The rejection of claims 23, 33 and 34 is moot with the cancellation thereof. This rejection does not set forth a sustainable finding of obviousness for these claims and is traversed.

The remarks concerning Rüsç regarding the previous rejection are repeated here as equally pertinent. Rüsç does not disclose or suggest the limitations of independent claims 40 and 45. Claims 4, 14 and 15 include additional limitations that further distinguish over Rüsç.

Amendment to Accompany Request for
Continued Examination (RCE)
Applicants: Rudy Mazzocchi et al.
Serial No.: 10/051,591

Attorney Docket: MVA1001USC4

Accordingly, this rejection is unworkable and must be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of Applicants' present amendments to the claims and the remarks above, all of the claims are submitted to be in condition for allowance.

If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 16-2312. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/4/05

By Terry Wiles

Customer No. 009561
Terry L. Wiles (29,989)
Patrick J. O'Connell (33,984)
Cecilia Jaisle (28,824)
POPOVICH, WILES &
O'CONNELL, P.A.
650 Third Avenue South, Suite 600
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 334-8989
Attorneys for Applicants